RESOLUTIONS.

Resolution No. 26.

MR. H. C. DASAPPA moved the following resolution:—

"That this Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja the desirability of appointing an expert Committee to investigate the present position of the Bhadravati Iron Works, and to report on the possible lines of the future advancement of the Works.

In explaining his object, Mr. H. C. Dasappa said that he was anxious that the position of the Iron Works should be thoroughly investigated by persons who were in daily touch with trade and commercial conditions. There was no use including in the Committee members who had little knowledge about the industry.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA did not agree in this view.

Continuing, MR. H. C. DASAPPA said that even among the ordinary men, people with practical experience of business should be included. So far, over 3 crores of rupees had been spent on the Works and more than one-third of that amount had also been written off. In spite of all this, the Works had not begun to bring any profit, though in the Dewan's Opening Address to the Assembly the situation was referred to in rather hopeful terms. Referring to the working of the Iron Works in the past years, he conveyed the thanks of the Assembly members to Sir M. Visvesvaraya who was at the helm of affairs till recently. Unfortunately, however, Sir M. Visvesvaraya had just resigned his Chairmanship of the Works. No doubt, it was a matter of some satisfaction and hope for the future that the First Member of Council, in whose ability and patriotism the House had every confidence, had taken up the Chairmanship. There was still an impression that the work at Bhadravati could not proceed satisfactorily unless an expert committee was appointed to examine the entire position and submit recommendations as to how best the work should be carried on. In the first place, pig iron had to face marketting difficulties. Secondly, the members understood that there was not the heartiest co-operation among the different departments of the Iron Works. Thirdly, there was an impression that expenditure on the Works was capable of material curtailment. For instance, two Directors for the Pipe Foundry appeared to him unnecessary. To examine all these questions and to find out how the iron could be sold to the best

advantage, a committee was very necessary. Whether or not a committee was necessary in the opinion of Government, the acceptance by them of this resolution would help to dispel all the misgivings that the public entertained from time to time in regard to the Works and secure the co-operation of the public.

MR. M. C. LINGE GOWDA seconded the resolution. He said that the State would be losing very heavy sums of money if for any reason the Works failed. The responsibility of Government had considerably increased consequent on the resignation of Sir Visvesvaraya. It was advisable, therefore, to appoint an expert committee just at this juncture. Nobody would be opposed to continue the Works if that committee considered it desirable to do so. Otherwise, it might be safe to give them up at this stage at least. He himself had visited the Works more than once, but being a layman, could not understand all the details of working at Bhadravati. In these circumstances he hoped that Government would accept the resolution.

MR. M. NANJAPPA also favoured the appointment of a Committee, as he thought that articles manufactured at Bhadravati would find better sales in case the suggestions of experts were obtained and adopted.

MR. RAMADOSS was glad that the First Member of Council had taken up the Chairmanship of the Iron Works. But he was doubtful how far he would be able to effect all the improvements he might like to, unless he was relieved of other work. He therefore suggested that the First Member be requested to be in sole charge of the Works and devote all his time and attention to them.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA observed that the Iron Works had consumed a lot of public money and was in the nature of a white elephant to the State. If it did not prove a financial success, all the expenditure incurred on it would become a waste and to that extent there would be reason for the people to feel that many useful benefits which would have accrued from that sum if applied to other concerns, were denied to them. Lakhs of rupees would have to be incurred for the necessary repairs and renewals in course of time. Yet, no amount was being set apart from the sale receipts of the Works towards this charge. The Public Accounts Committee had pointed out that the Works were not bringing in adequate returns, that there was over-valuation of stock and that there was a consequent over-estimation of income. At Budget time each year, no losses

were anticipated; but at the end thereof there used to be heavy losses reported. Another point to be noted was that for the ore supplied by the State, no Royalty was being paid by the Works, and so there was no reason why the Works should incur any losses at all, specially, as the State was giving large allotments for working expenses. The Forest Department was supplying all the fuel required and the charges paid therefor did not come up even to the value of timber. In spite of all this if the Works could not show better results, it would be a serious problem as to whether at all it was worthwhile carrying on a competitive commercial concern which was always losing. The Board of Visitors called for detailed accounts which were not forthcoming. They had to be satisfied with whatever particulars furnished to them by the General Manager. The Committee of Management did not consist of representative non-officials from the two constitutional Houses. To a concern which was so full of defects and drawbacks, the Government was making extravagant grants, to the detriment of many urgent and utilitarian objects. For all these reasons it was advisable to appoint a Committee consisting of experts from outside the State with experience of similar concerns. Whether it was worthwhile continuing the Works, and if so how best they should be made to bring in better results, were matters for urgent decision, and it would perhaps be best that a Joint Stock Company was brought into being and the Works handed over to them.

MR. M. L. NAGAPPA SETTY thought that it was too early to condemn the Iron Works which were still in infancy. The figures now available did not represent the losses, because all the expenditure so far incurred on buildings, for example, was really there in the shape of assets. The expenditure incurred on the Works was sure to return to the State several times over in course of time. The percentage of income was steadily improving. So far, the State and its subjects were not used to run concerns of such magnitude and so it was natural for some to fear that the Works were involving the State in avoidable expenditure of public money. To know the correct position it was best to consult expert opinion. Secondly, there were not many within the State who knew all about the iron industry and so it was desirable to depute some one to foreign countries to specialize in it. Thirdly, he did not agree with Mr. Mallappa in that the Iron Works were a white elephant. If they were properly worked they were certain to be a great asset. To give useful suggestions

in regard to these matters he agreed that an expert Committee was necessary but in any case he thought that the Works should not be shut down.

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH said that he saw Mysore pig iron lying idle at Bombay and Goa Harbours. The legislature voted for all the expenditure incurred on the Works during successive years only because certain false hopes were held out to it by the Government and the Management in a certain confidential note circulated to the House. Those hopes were certainly not fulfilled and the price of pig iron was always showing a marked fall. Such being the case, he asked, what was the use of all the statements of account which were being circulated by the Board of Management, which contained figures that did not correctly describe the position of the Works? The Management refused to furnish all the accounts which the Board of Visitors called for, and on that matter there was already an Interpellation pending before the House. For so many popular schemes the Government pleaded inability to provide funds, and he questioned how they managed to make liberal grants to the Iron Works.

MR. NAGAPPA SETTY asked whether the speaker believed that all the figures published by the Board of Management relating to the Works were wrong and could be proved to be so.

MR. SANJEEVIAH repeated that the figures already furnished were unreliable. For example, the profits were shown on the valuation of the products manufactured, rather than on the realizations by actual sale. He strongly urged for the appointment of a committee as suggested. It might be that there were already one or two committees connected with the Works but they had not tried to satisfy the public regarding the soundness of the scheme. There were grave misgivings about the financial side of the Works, in view of the considerable divergence between the two versions given by Mr. Paramasiva Iyer and Sir Visvesvaraya respectively.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that that was inevitable where criticisms from one side radically differed from facts.

MR SANJEEVIAH replied that if this was so, it was quite open to the General Manager to point out the inaccuracies in Mr. Paramasiva Iyer's allegations. The General Manager once issued a statement but never met the points made out by that gentleman. Of course so far as the future was concerned, the members of the Assembly were

confident that the financial side of the Works would be impartially made known to the public, now that the First Member of Council, who was the Finance Member on the Executive Council, had taken over the Chairmanship. At the same time, to give the Chairman the assistance he needed and to guard against any adverse criticism on his administration of the Works, the appointment of an expert committee was very desirable. The competition in the iron market was very keen, and even long-established works in foreign countries had been closed down. Just now, there was the prospect of the Russian pig iron also coming into India as a result of the Anglo-Russian Treaty. If again foreign iron found its way into the country, the Bhadravati Works would have to face worse days still. To prevent such a position and to consider all aspects of the Works, he requested that a committee like the one prayed for should be appointed.

KHAN BAHADUR MAHOMAD ABBAS KHAN stated that the resolution under discussion did not seek to undermine the importance or the management of the Iron Works. All that it sought to achieve was that the market conditions being so unfavourable to iron, it was necessary to consider how best to secure further improvements in the Works. As this was a laudable object and as there was everything to be gained by the appointment of a non-official Technical Committee, he supported the resolution.

MR. S. N. M. RAZVI regretted that while the wording of the resolution showed that the movers wanted to ascertain the mode of securing the future interests of the Works, the speeches made in support of it dilated on the losses accruing from year to year. He had no objection to a committee being appointed as proposed, but he only hoped that the committee would adhere to the wording of the resolution and not recommend the shutting down of the Works.

MR. SHAMPUR PAPANNA was glad that the Iron Works had been manufacturing so many bye-products in addition to pig iron, such as coal tar, etc. If these bye-products were developed, they were certain to bring in large revenues to the State. If the committee proposed was appointed and the right sort of persons constituted it, he hoped that very useful results would follow. He would ask for an assurance from the committee that they would do everything to promote the Works. Secondly, he was not particular about confining membership of the committee to Mysoreans. As a highly technical industry was concerned

and the persons to submit recommendations had necessarily to be experts, he suggested that, if necessary, outsiders also might be selected to serve on the committee.

MR. B. L. BYANNA stated that it was not possible to expect large profits from such a big industry at the very outset. At the instance of the Representative Assembly and the Legislative Council, large economics had been effected and he was sure that the works would yield good results in course of time. The Dewan had stated in his Opening Address that the Works were beginning to pay. He did not therefore see any necessity for a fresh committee to consider the position of the Works, and if one was appointed, it would only result in increasing the establishment charges against which there were loud protests from time to time. He appealed to the House to patiently wait till the next Budget Session of the House in order to see the financial result of the current year's working of the Iron Works, and for the present he felt compelled to oppose the resolution which entailed needless expenditure.

MR. RAMALINGA SETTY said that Government were financing the concern without any hesitation and there was plenty of raw materials as well as fuel. With such unlimited help, the Works ought to have yielded much better results than they had. One reason for the financial failure, which he considered as important, was that over-head charges were too heavy. The Iron Works was an industry which was sure to bring in very large profits at least in future, and it was up to the Government to ascertain how best this could be done. For this reason he supported the resolution. But he was particular that first-rate Mysoreans alone should be appointed to the committee, unless there was absolute need to bring in a few outsiders also. He also suggested that at least two members of the committee should permanently halt at Bhadravati and acquaint themselves with the working of the concern personally. He suggested further that monthly reports should be submitted to Government by them. He was in favour of taking up the manufacture of some more bye-products if the committee also recommended this being done. So far as the appointment of a committee itself was concerned, he was whole-heartedly in favour.

MR. K. SRIKANTIAH considered that the appointment of an expert committee at the present juncture would only bring about further practical difficulties and would by no means facilitate smooth working.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL explained that the Works, which had now been under operation for about 6½ years, had been improving gradually. There were still many difficulties to be met and many connected problems to be solved. The financial position of the Works would have been better if the price of iron had not fallen as it had steadily done in the past few years. There was great competition and all possible efforts had to be made to stabilise the condition of the Works. The officers of the Works had acquired much experience and whenever possible the advice of experts, if available, was being obtained. A period of 6½ years could not be considered too long for a work of this magnitude to overcome all its difficulties and yield profits. Iron and steel were essential needs, and with iron deposits in the State it was only right that they should be produced in the country. The bye-products were selling fairly well and there was much scope for developing these products. For some time past, the conditions had not been favourable for Iron Works in India and even outside, and the Mysore Iron Works had also had to face these adverse conditions.

There were difficulties in the way of appointing an expert committee. This was the only Charcoal Iron concern in India and it was not possible to get experts in India in this line of business to be members of the committee other than persons on the staff of the Bhadravati Works. Even out of India the number of Charcoal Iron Furnaces and Wood Distillation Plants were very few and the experts with a knowledge of such furnaces and plants would not give out the secrets of their trade.

The general condition of the Works was slowly improving and the Indian Stores Department had recently spoken in high terms of the quality of Mysore pipes which were considered to be as good as any made in India or imported from outside.

In view of all these considerations, no useful purpose would be served by appointing a committee of the kind suggested in the resolution.

In reply to the debate, MR. DASAPPA said that the Government did not properly understand the scope of the resolution. The main point of his resolution was that the people did not receive adequate benefit from the operations. When crores of rupees had been spent on the Works from the tax-payers' money, it was but natural that the people should seek to know how the works were going on. The

original estimate for the Works was about 80 lakhs, and it rose to over two crores later. The Board of Management always said that the corner was turned and the time for the declaration of profits would come if only some additional amount was sanctioned for certain things. But as a matter of fact, he said that the existing condition of Works was all but satisfactory. They always said that extra amount was necessary to show better results. They also gave a very good account of the working.

With reference to the First Member's statement that there were no other experts with regard to charcoal furnace in India than those at the Bhadravati Works, he said if such were really the case and if all that they said had to be accepted, then he failed to understand why the Government turned down the proposal of the Board of Management in regard to the Steel Foundry. That showed to his mind that the opinion of the Board was also not the final word.

Mr. Dasappa added that within the past about one year, nearly one crore of rupees had been written down and what would follow next could not be imagined. He also failed to know how long the forests could feed the furnace and how long the unsettled state of affairs at the Works would continue.

With reference to the Board of Visitors he said that the Government gave them absolutely no facilities to find out the real state of affairs at Bhadravati. The Members were not allowed to interview the sectional officers to get first hand information, but on the other hand, they were always told to interview only the General Manager who always gave a very rosy picture of the working. He did not like the idea of the Board of Visitors remaining only as an ornament.

Continuing Mr. Dasappa said that no kind of depreciation fund had been organised and it would be necessary very soon to replace the retorts, machinery, etc., for which money had to be found. For all these reasons, an expert committee, he said, was absolutely necessary.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA enquired whether there was not a saw-mill lying idle at the Works.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that there was no help for it as it was purchased at the instance of some experts in the past.

MR. DASAPPA continuing complained that there were no non-official members in the Board of Management.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF Council replied that there

were SIR K. P. PUTTANNA CHETTY and MR. CHANDY who had been connected with two biggest Iron Works in India.

MR. DASAPPA observed that the Government did not generally accept their opinion and therefore an expert committee was necessary.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that it was difficult to get experts of the kind required.

MR DASAPPA said that nothing was known about the actual financial condition of the Works. It was not also known what the Financial Assistant was doing and what powers he had. He thought that a proper directorate just as in any private industrial concern was urgently called for. His only anxiety was that having spent crores of rupees on this industry it was necessary that the Government should get an adequate return. He was firmly of opinion that two heads were better than one and that the opinion of the expert committee proposed in the resolution would further strengthen the hands of not only the existing Board of Management but also of the Government. He had no objection to the Government accepting or rejecting the opinion of that expert committee, but his only object was to urge that the Government should not accept the opinion of the Board of Management as a gospel truth.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that it was not only the opinion of the Board that was considered by the Government, but the reports from the local officers were also received and considered with it.

MR. DASAPPA continuing said that the Government had been exploiting the forests and he failed to know how long the forests would last. There were several things for investigation which could not be mentioned openly in the Assembly in the interests of the Works themselves. He contented himself by saying that the appointment of an expert committee was absolutely necessary. In the nature of things, he had expected that the First Member of Council would accept the resolution for the simple reason that he was called upon to preside over the Board of Management in succession to Sir M. Visvesvaraya.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that the First Member could not come to any decision on the spur of the moment without having sufficient previous knowledge about the Works. If, after some experience, he could find that the opinion of an expert committee was called for, there was no doubt that he would himself suggest the appointment of such a committee.

MR. CHENNABASAPPA did not see any harm in appointing a committee at all. He thought that a committee would infuse better confidence in the people.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA complained that the Board of Visitors was given no powers at all.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that they were merely meant to see and know the things for themselves by an inspection of the Works from time to time and that they were not meant to exercise any power over the Works.

THE DEWAN said that the Government could not say that no expert committee was necessary but that they felt that at present there was no necessity for it. The Government had been vigilant and consulted several experts at various times. Sir M. Visvesvaraya himself was an expert at the head of the affairs for nearly seven years. Sir Alfred Chatterton had been to the Works and the Members of the Tariff Board had also visited the Works.

In regard to Sir Visvesvaraya, THE DEWAN said that he had even gone outside India to collect the necessary information and study several matters connected with the pig iron industry, and that he had complete knowledge in regard to the resources of the forests also. He added that the First Member of Council had just taken charge of the management and it was quite necessary that before he could make up his mind one way or the other, he should have time to study the question. He felt no doubt that if the First Member of Council found it later on necessary to appoint an expert committee as suggested, he would be the first man to suggest such a course. In regard to the complaint made on behalf of the Board of Visitors he said that it was not right to allow the members of the Board to interview subordinate officers, but that they should approach the General Manager who was there to furnish the necessary information.

MR. D. S. MALAPPA said that if the members of the Board of Visitors obtained any information from the sectional officers, Government might rest assured that they would not publish such information.

THE DEWAN replied that discipline required that subordinate officers should not be interviewed by others in regard to the Works.

On the assurance given by the Dewan MR. DASAPPA withdrew his resolution.

Resolution No. 24.

MR. H. C. DASAPPA moved the following resolution:—

"That this Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that the Mysore District be given the privilege of electing two persons to the Legislative Council, one from the northern and the other from the southern taluks, in view of the large extent and population and the number of voters in the District."

In moving this resolution, Mr. Dasappa said that the Mysore District was the largest district in the State consisting of 15 taluks and 22,000 voters. The Government had also realised this fact and had under their contemplation the division of the district into two, *viz.*, Mysore and Mandya Districts. It was not possible for one member from that district to do full justice to his electorate. He added that there was no prohibition anywhere in the Regulation that the district should not return more than one member. For these reasons, he commended the resolution for the acceptance of the House.

MR. RAMDOSS seconded the resolution.

MR. BYÀNNA moved an amendment to the effect that every district in the State should have two representatives to be returned to the Legislative Council. He said that if this was done, there would be better scope for non-official members to represent the grievances of the district.

MR. NAGAPPA SETTY seconded the amendment.

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH said that although the number of taluks had been increased in the Mysore District, the area of the district remained the same. So far as the Bangalore District was concerned, there was similarly an addition of one taluk in place of a sub-taluk. He thought that the number of taluks in a district should not be a criterion for representation in the Legislative Council. He supported Mr. Byanna's amendment for extending the privilege to all the districts.

MR. S. VENKATESAIYA said that the number of voters of taluks should not alone be the criterion in this regard. There were special and minority interests also to be taken into consideration. In his opinion, if Mysore should be given one more representative, it would be necessary to properly examine the Regulation and the Rules before coming to a decision. It should not also be forgotten that the Mysore City Municipality was included in the district and it had got a separate representative.

KHAN BAHADUR MD. ABBAS KHAN said that at present both big and small districts were treated alike in the matter

of returning members to the Legislative Council. He added that when the Kadur District which had only five taluks was given the privilege of returning one member to the Legislative Council, the Mysore District which had 15 taluks, with 5 Revenue and 2 Police Sub-Divisions, should certainly return more representatives. The reason why the City Municipalities had been given separate representation was that the one representative of the district could not properly look after the interests of the Municipality which had various special and other interests. He thought that before coming to a decision, the extent, population and voting strength should be taken into consideration and if all those were considered, Mysore really deserved two seats on the Legislative Council.

MR. SIDDALINGAPPA SETTY said that the Kadur District should not be judged from the point of view of the number of taluks. The people of the maidan parts could not properly appreciate the difficulties of the malnad. The representatives from the bigger districts of Mysore and Bangalore had the opportunity of meeting the officers of Government very often, which opportunity was denied to representatives from the malnad. For that reason, he thought that the remoter districts should really have greater representation in the Legislative Council. He also said that the malnad had no railway communication; transport was difficult and it was impossible for one representative to travel through the whole district to find out the real grievances of the people. For these reasons he said that Kadur should have two representatives.

MR. GOPALACHAR agreed in the above view. With reference to the Shimoga District, he said that the district had 20,000 voters and even nominations did not touch that district. He thought that nominations might be altogether cancelled and every district given the privilege of returning two members to the Legislative Council.

THE DEWAN said that the question was outside practical politics.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA said that as the strength of the Legislative Council was fixed under the constitution at 50, it would not be possible to give two representatives to the districts, unless the strength was increased. If that was not done and each district was given two representatives, there would be 16 members from the Districts; 2 from the premier Municipalities; 8 from the Representative Assembly; 4 Special Interests and 8 Nominations. There would thus

be nearly 40 members against 30 at present. Whether the Government would agree to increase the non-official strength in the Council to that figure was more than he could say. To be on the safer side, he thought that for the present, one more representative to the Mysore District might be given without interfering with the existing constitution. In regard to all that was said about the Kadur District he thought that because the district was far removed from Bangalore, it did not mean that it was neglected.

In conclusion he thought that a beginning might be made with only the Mysore District as proposed. In this view, he opposed the amendment.

MR. E. KRISHNAPPA said that when the bifurcation of the Mysore District which was under contemplation became an accomplished fact, there would necessarily be two members from the present Mysore District and as such, there was no harm in allowing the district to return two members immediately, pending such bifurcation.

MR. RAMESWARA SASTRY proposed an alternative in that the 8 representatives from the Representative Assembly to the Legislative Council might be according to the districts.

MR. KATTE DAKAPPA supported the amendment.

MR. S. C. MALLAIYA opposed the amendment. He said that each taluk had the privilege of returning two or three members to the Representative Assembly according to its population, revenue capacity and the voting strength. Similarly, if any district in the State approached the Mysore District in regard to all the criteria, by all means the number of members to be returned to the Legislative Council might be increased. But he thought that at present it was only the Mysore District that had satisfied all the conditions. He also observed that as there was a proposal to bifurcate the district into two, it might be allowed to return two members to the Legislative Council anticipating orders on the question of bifurcation.

Mr. Dasappa's point of view was that if the amendment was accepted, it would necessitate the revision of the Regulation itself. But, on the other hand, if the resolution, as it was, was accepted, there would be no such necessity. Under the constitution, there was room for nominations to the maximum extent of 8 members. If Mysore District was given one more member, the number to be nominated would be reduced to seven, for which no amendment of the Regulation was necessary.

MR. HOSAKOPPA KRISHNA RAO said that even to increase the number from one to two in the Mysore District, an amendment of the Regulation was necessary and that the resolution was itself out of order because it dealt with a constitutional matter which was beyond the purview of the House. He however thanked the Government for having allowed the discussion on the subject.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL explained that there was no necessity to amend the Regulation if the request made in the resolution was to be granted.

Why the Regulation required amendment was explained by MR. HOSKOPPA KRISHNA RAO as follows: The resolution contemplated two constituencies, one, the northern taluks and the other, the southern taluks, which had not been provided for in the second schedule of the Regulation.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that if the resolution was to the effect that the number of members returnable from the Mysore District should be increased by one, no amendment to the Regulation was required, but if it was contemplated that the northern taluks should be made into one constituency and the southern taluks into another, then an amendment to the Regulation would be necessary.

MR. H. C. DASAPPA said that the operative portion of the resolution was that the Mysore District should have two members instead of one and the allocation proposed there, was only a matter of procedure in that while there was no division among the voters according to the northern or southern taluks, it was only necessary to elect one from one part and the other from the other part.

MR. BELUR SRINIVASA IYENGAR agreed with MR. HOSAKOPPA KRISHNA RAO in the view that even for increasing the number of members from one to two in the Mysore District, the Regulation should be amended.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that under the Regulation the number of members to be returned from each urban constituency had not been fixed at one only. The Government might if necessary increase the number. He said that under the Regulation there ought to be 10 members from the rural and urban constituencies; 8 from the Representative Assembly and 4 from non-territorial constituencies and if there was still room, nothing prevented the Government from allowing any district more than one member. The only point for consideration was whether it was desirable to give the Mysore District an additional member. Whether the other districts would not

have a grievance if this was done only in the case of the Mysore District, was a separate matter. He added that under Rule 6 (2) (*d*) Government had power to make rules regarding the constitution of the constituencies and other matters.

THE LAW SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT explained that as the Regulation stated ".....the *remainder* shall be nominated by the Government for the representation of special interests and minorities or for any other cause...." the only result of increasing the number of elected members from any district was that it would reduce prorata the nominated element.

MR. NILIGIRI SANJEEVIAH was of the opinion that the resolution must be considered as it stood.

MR. HOSAKOPPA KRISHNA RAO was of opinion that the acceptance of the resolution required an amendment of the Regulation, while the amendment did not create any such necessity.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL, however, disagreed with the above view.

MR. VENKATESAIYA said that the resolution specified two constituencies which were not contemplated by the schedule attached to the Regulation and hence he thought that the grant of the request contained in the resolution would require the amendment of the Regulation.

MR. C. NARASIMHAIYA was of opinion that if the whole district was allowed to vote for two persons, there would be no trouble.

MR. BELUR SRINIVASA IYENGAR pointed out that if both the members elected came from the same taluk, the object of the movers of the resolution would not be gained.

THE DEWAN at this stage said that the matter might be left at that, and that the Government would examine the question in detail. It would have to be seen how far the acceptance of either the resolution or the amendment was possible and how far it required the Regulation to be amended. At any rate, the opinion of the House, it was evident, was divided. The question of giving the same consideration to the other districts also was an important matter to be considered.

MR. DASAPPA observed that if the amendment was accepted, there would be no room for nominations. He enquired how the Government would tackle this question if the amendment was accepted.

THE DEWAN replied that the Government would at

that stage neither agree to the resolution nor to the amendment but all that they could say was that the question would be examined.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that so far as Government were concerned, it could be definitely stated that Mr. Byanna's amendment required an amendment of the Regulation.

MR. HOSAKOPPA KRISHNA RAO disagreed with this view and said that if each district was given the privilege of returning two members the remaining seats alone would be thrown open for nomination according to the principle enunciated by the Law Secretary. If there was no room for nomination, then there need be no nominations at all. He therefore thought that technically the motion was out of order, but that the amendment was quite in order.

As the motion was about to be upt to vote, MR. DASAPPA enquired what the final opinion of Government was.

THE DEWAN replied that Government could not express any view on the matter, but that the question would be reserved for further consideration. The members cannot expect Government to give a decision on every matter brought before the House then and there.

The resolution was not pressed to a division.

At this stage, the Assembly adjourned for lunch and re-assembled at 3-30 p.m.

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH desired to know whether the adjournment motion relating to the loss of three lives due to a motor bus accident near Nelamangala could be taken up for discussion.

THE DEWAN replied that he had disallowed the motion.

MR. B. P. BASAPPA SETTY then asked permission to discuss the adjournment motion in regard to the appointments in the Education Department.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that the matter was neither recent nor urgent. He promised however to give every information in connection with the Interpellation on the subject.

RESOLUTIONS—(*Contd*).

Resolution No. 28.

MR. S. V. GURUMURTHYACHARYA moved the following resolution:—

"That this Assembly recommends to the Government of His